

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES
April 23, 2008

Chair Knox White called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:35 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL** – Roll was called and the following recorded.

Members Present:

John Knox White
Michael Krueger
Robert McFarland
Robb Ratto
Eric Schatmeier (arrived at 8:00 p.m.)
Srikant Subramaniam
Nielsen Tam

Staff Present:

Obaid Khan, Supervising Civil Engineer
Barry Bergman, Transportation Coordinator
Barbara Hawkins, City Engineer
Michael Fisher, Division Chief, Fire Department

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. January 23, 2008

Commissioner Ratto moved approval of the minutes for the January 23, 2008, meeting and minutes as presented. *Commissioner McFarland* seconded the motion. Motion passed 5-0-1 (*Commissioner Krueger* abstained). Absent: *Commissioner Schatmeier*.

- b. March 26, 2008

Commissioner Krueger moved approval of the minutes for the March 26, 2008, meeting and minutes as presented. *Commissioner McFarland* seconded the motion. Motion passed 5-0-1 (*Commissioner Ratto* abstained). Absent: *Commissioner Schatmeier*.

3. **AGENDA CHANGES**

There were none.

4. **COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS**

Chair Knox White noted that the Bicycle Plan Subcommittee had met briefly, during which the process for moving forward was discussed.

Chair Knox White noted that the Pedestrian Task Force had met, which will be discussed later in the meeting.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Open public comment.

Councilmember Doug DeHaan provided an informational update regarding the Esplanade project approved by the City Council within Harbor Bay and concerns expressed by some community members. Public concern had been expressed about the ferry service, and that the parking lot at the terminal was at 90 to 100% capacity every day, which limited the City's ability to add ridership to the ferry.

The Council expressed an interest in looking at alternatives for improving ferry ridership. He noted that the commercial portion of the Harbor Bay Association had run a very successful shuttle service from BART and within the development itself. He added that it was a private effort, and in doing so, it had served their population well. The developer who sat on the Harbor Bay Board noted that he could not commit them to extend that, but that he would work with the rest of the community to look at extending a shuttle service into Harbor Bay. *Councilmember DeHaan* stated that another option that was suggested was developing a staging area near the beginning of Ron Cowan Parkway where people could park and take a shuttle to the ferry terminal. A third alternative would be to restripe the existing parking lot, which, he estimated, could create perhaps ten additional parking spaces. He encouraged the Commission look at the alternatives.

Councilmember DeHaan discussed the farebox recovery ratio history for the service and noted that the Council wants the ferry to be successful. He noted that the additional activity from new development would be helpful to the ferry. He encouraged the Transportation Commission and Public Works to move forward on this issue and to provide an update. He noted that a shuttle service would benefit not only Alameda residents, but also people from other areas via the Ron Cowan Parkway.

Bill Smith wished to discuss the fourth bore and fourth platform for BART, and stated that he had been instrumental in getting bicycles onto BART and the buses. He believed a shuttle would be able to connect the different neighborhoods to Alameda Point. He was glad that there were no overhead elevated tracks and steel wheels on the rapid transit trains. He discussed SunCal and the TOD.

Close public comment.

6A. Resident Appeal of Parking Restrictions on to Provide Emergency Access on Palace Court (Continued from March 26, 2008 meeting).

Staff Bergman presented the staff report. He summarized the history of the project, and displayed and described the appellant's concerns. The Alameda Municipal Code authorized the Public Works Director to remove parking based on safety considerations.

Staff solicited input from residents, and received some comments in favor, some in opposition, as well as some suggested alternatives, such as allowing people to park on the sidewalks, as was done previously. The Fire Code required a 20-foot clearance for emergency vehicle access. The Fire Department indicated that they had some vehicles that were 9.5 feet wide, which so removing parking on one side of the street would be sufficient, as it would provide 16 feet of clearance. To mitigate the impacts, parking was removed on the even side of the street, as fewer spaces were impacted. He noted that the two-hour parking restriction on the other side of the street was removed to provide full-time on-street parking for four additional spaces.

Staff Bergman noted that the decision was appealed, and that the appellant made several points. The appellant believed that there were alternative methods of providing access, such as sidewalk parking, that would allow the on-street parking to be retained.

Staff noted that this recommendation was not made because it was prohibited by Section 22500(f) of the California Vehicle Code, which stated that “no person shall stop, park, or leave standing any vehicle, whether attended or unattended, except when necessary to avoid conflict with other traffic, or in compliance with the directions of a peace officer or official traffic control device on any portion of a sidewalk, or with the body of the vehicle extending over any portion of a sidewalk.” In addition, the sidewalks are not constructed to support the weight of the vehicles, and there was concern about the impact that parking on the sidewalk would have on pedestrian traffic. The appellant submitted a letter subsequent to his initial appeal, raising additional points. One suggestion was to relocate the curb to widen the street, in order to provide emergency access. The Alameda Municipal Code required that public sidewalks be at least five feet in width; by removing the 18 inches from each side of the street, that would provide an additional three feet, giving 27 feet. Since the parking lane was typically eight feet wide, that would leave only 11 feet of clear space available, which would be insufficient for emergency access.

The appellant further suggested that a parking permit program, which had been discussed by the City as a number of neighborhoods in the City are dealing with similar problems. When staff researched the costs and other requirements to implement such a program, it was found that it was typically funded through the General Fund. At this time, the City had difficulty in finding resources at this time. He noted that may be viable in the future, but would not be practical at this time.

Staff Bergman noted that the appellant’s second basis for appeal noted that a request had been made for a hearing regarding this matter, and the Municipal Code authorized the Public Works Director to implement parking prohibitions based on safety considerations prior to the appeal being held. This TC meeting provided the appellant, as well as other members of the public, with the opportunity to request that the decision be overturned.

Staff Bergman noted that the third basis for appeal was a request for documentation establishing the need to eliminate the on-street parking. This information was communicated to the appellant and other affected resident in the notification sent out on January 23, a copy of that letter was included in the packet. Also included were the

initial appeal, the subsequent letter from the appellant, and comments from residents. Given that the 18 spaces has been removed from one side of the street, and full-time parking has been restored at four additional spaces, there was a net loss of 14 full-time on-street parking spaces. Staff recommended that the Transportation Commission support the Public Works Director's decision to eliminate the parking on the odd side of the street.

Commissioner Krueger noted that there appeared to be a pickup truck and a large boat trailer, and inquired whether staff had observed that on the site. *Staff Khan* replied that he had not seen it on the site. *Commissioner Krueger* inquired whether it was legal to park those large vehicles on the street, given the existing parking problem. *Staff Khan* replied that there was a restriction of commercial vehicles to be parked in residential areas, and there were some time limits as well.

In response to an inquiry by *Commissioner Krueger* whether 10 feet would be enough width to fit the 9.5-foot-wide vehicle through, *Michael Fisher*, Fire Department, replied that it would be very impractical, and that the Fire Code required a minimum of 20 feet in width. An allowance was being made by bringing the width down to 16 feet.

Open public comment

Marc Voisenat, appellant, noted that the street was 24 feet wide, and noted that taking parking from one side of the street only created 16 feet. He believed that if 20 feet was needed, that the neighborhood should not settle for 16 feet. He had not realized that the Fire Department had made an allowance to 14 feet, and did not know how they came to that determination. He believed that if the Fire Department took the position that the Code should be followed, then it should be adhered to. He displayed a photo of the street, and noted that two vehicles were allowed to park on the sidewalk in a special parking designation. He believed that if they were allowed to make those accommodations there, and the Fire Department allowed accommodations to shorten the width of the lane, then he believed his suggestions should be considered. He noted that some of his ideas originated from the City, such as parking on the street curb. He suggested that trimming 1.5 feet from each side of the street, and making the width of the parking seven feet would yield 14 feet with parking on both sides of the street. He suggested that the City at least mark the parking spots, and added that people generally parked as close to the other vehicles as safely possible in order to create more parking spots. He noted that church parkers generally were not aware of that, and sometimes parked where they could take up two to three spots with one car. He believed that painting the parking spaces would not have a big fiscal impact for the City. He did not understand the difficulty in implementing and supervising permit parking, and did not believe it would be more difficult than supervising a no-parking zone. He believed that the fees for the parking permits would help supplement the cost of supervising the program, and added that it would also give the appearance that parking was restricted on Palace Court. He believed that 14 feet would be sufficient for the fire vehicles to pass.

Edith Brady, 529 Palace Court, noted that the boat and truck had been moved to their

backyard. They did not have any parking, and created a parking spot where part of their yard had been. She noted that the police have been citing people parking on the street recently. She supported permit parking on the street, since she had also received a ticket. She noted that the appellant did not have any parking at all.

Robert McDowell, Palace Court resident, was concerned about fairness and equity, and inquired why Palace Court had been singled out for this treatment, when there were similar situations on streets such as Hoover Court. He did not believe there was consistent treatment, and believed this was more about a neighbor with an agenda rather than safety. He noted that some people had done some unusual things to reserve parking, such as one neighbor who converted a garage to a bedroom and placed a “No Parking” sign in front of the bedroom. He would like both of those issues resolved, and believed that the similar *cul de sacs* in Alameda should receive the same treatment.

Bill Smith noted that this street had been a main street when most of the streets in Alameda were buggy lanes. He noted that the trucks were destroying the streets, and believed that people should use alternative modes of transportation.

Karen Goddin, 527F Palace Court, inquired where the closest fire hydrant was located. *Staff Fisher* replied that it was on Central Avenue. She further inquired why an emergency response could not be made with a smaller vehicle than a fire truck. Mr. Fisher replied that the typical response to an emergency medical service call in Alameda required one engine company with three personnel (captain, driver and a paramedic), as well as a paramedic ambulance with two paramedics on it, for a total of five people. He noted that was the minimum County-required response within the City of Alameda.

Matthew McHenry, 534 Palace Court, believed the permit parking should be examined, and that it would be the best and easiest solution. He would like to know why it was such an expensive and difficult solution.

Close public comment.

Chair Knox White reminded the Commission that this was an appeal hearing, rather than trying to solve the problem. The Commission may make recommendations to staff following the Commission’s decision.

Commissioner Krueger believed that more time should be given to the alternatives, and requested that staff answer the question about the parking permit, specifically about the break-even cost for the system itself.

Staff Khan replied that *Staff Bergman*’s research regarding cities such as Berkeley and Walnut Creek found that the cities had created a neighborhood parking program, which was subsidized by the General Fund. He understood that the question was whether the permit program could be fully paid by the residents. In order to make the program viable, the permits must be issued and tracked, and guest permits must be issued, fees must be collected and enforcement must take place. He noted the resources would be extensive

for a smaller program, and that this was viable on a larger scale; in that case, police officers and other personnel could be hired just for the permit program.

Commissioner Ratto thanked the Fire Department for living in the real world and accepting the 16-foot-wide fire lane, rather than the 20-foot width required by Code. He noted that if that were not the case, the neighborhood would not have any parking on either side of the street. He noted that because the Commission was only dealing with the appeal, he would bring the public comment brought forth by *Mr. McDowell* regarding other streets to staff and request that they look into it. He noted that he had grown up in Alameda, and was aware of two different instances where houses had burned to the ground because the Fire Department did not have access to them. In those cases, parking had been changed to allow parking on only one side of the street. He was sensitive to public safety, and added that he would vote to deny the appeal.

Chair Knox White echoed *Commissioner Ratto's* comments, and shared his concern about selective enforcement on other streets. He understood that some allowances could be made to the 20-foot lane widths, and believed the selective enforcement stemmed more from a desire to avoid this problem on other streets, rather than ill will. He believed this issue should be addressed on a policy level by the City. He noted that the Transportation Commission has generally supported parking permits, and that they were cited in the Transportation Master Plan currently in circulation. He noted that the permit program should be made in a cost-neutral way when 10% budget cuts were being made to every program. He noted that the program would become cost prohibitive almost immediately. He noted that the Public Works Director identified this as a safety hazard, and that was the primary concern of the City. He believed the Fire Department had provided documentation establishing the need to eliminate on-street parking, as identified in Condition 3.

Commissioner Ratto moved to approve the staff recommendation to deny the appeal. *Commissioner McFarland* seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

Chair Knox White believed the City needed to address the permit parking issue, which continued to come up before the Commission. He understood staff's concern about setting the parking program up, and that because it was a benefit to the neighborhood, it should pay for itself. He would like staff to cost the proposed program out, in order to create a cost-neutral program.

Commissioner Krueger expressed concern about the photo of the handicapped spaces on the sidewalk, which seemed to contradict the Vehicle Code.

Staff Khan noted that the City had been trying to create allowances on that street, as well as the need for handicapped parking. Staff considered that it was located at the end of the street, with minimal fire access and through traffic issues. However, if the neighborhood was unhappy with that allowance and wanted those spaces removed, staff would take that into consideration.

7. NEW BUSINESS

7A. Review and Provide Recommendations on the Proposed Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for Fiscal Years 2008/2009 and 2009/2010.

Staff Hawkins presented the staff report, and reviewed the process for and projects in the Capital Improvement Program in detail. She noted that there was additional detail on the website at www.ci.alameda.ca.us. She noted that the CIP will go to City Council in June.

In response to an inquiry by *Chair Knox White* whether the carryover projects used previously allocated funds, *Staff Hawkins* replied that the money will have been earmarked and would not come out of the new budget. She added that there had been insufficient staff for approximately four years to address the carryover projects.

Commissioner Krueger inquired whether the website contained more details on the projects than what was available in the packet, *Staff Hawkins* replied that the data sheet for every project was available on the website. She added that there was generally a more detailed description of the proposed project, but that design plans were usually not included. She noted that further details could be obtained by calling the Lori Kozisek Public Works Department at 510/749-5840.

Staff Khan wished to point out the annual projects described in the packet, and noted that page 204 listed the Bicycle Program and the Safe Routes to School improvements. Under the Bicycle Program, the bulk of the money in 2008/2009 will be spending in preparation of the Bike Plan; the City anticipated that some of the projects will be implemented in 2009/2010. The Safe Routes to School improvements will be continued, and the maps will be developed throughout the City. This program also funded any requests from the Alameda Unified School District for analysis and review of drop-off zones and parking. He noted that the Congestion Management Plan funded streets in the Congestion Management Program, and the staff wished to avoid a situation where a deficiency plan must be created. The City may conduct studies addressing signal coordination and signal timing. On-call striping and signing work was performed upon Commissioner request, and the City was attempting to upgrade the signals to meet current requirements. He noted that the Transit Pass program issued all City employees an EcoPass or universal pass; he anticipated that the program would be in place in June or July of this year.

Chair Knox White inquired whether the \$110,000 in Measure B funds for the Bicycle Program was all for staff time. *Staff Khan* replied that most of the funds were earmarked for staff time to perform any studies. He added that most of the annual programs were for staff time, except for striping and signing. *Staff Hawkins* replied that all of the Bike and Ped funding was applied towards the Sidewalk Program. She noted that ACTIA requires that all projects funded through the bicycle and pedestrian portion of Measure B must be on an approved list, while projects funded through the streets and roads portion do not. By funding bicycle and pedestrian projects through the streets and roads funding it prevents the City from having to continually update the project list.

Commissioner Schatmeier inquired whether the City had joined the Alameda County program Safe Route to School program. He inquired whether that would come out of the CIP. *Staff Khan* replied that if funding were to be provided to the County, it would not come out of this program, and that it provided salaries for employees.

In response to an inquiry by *Chair Knox White* regarding the Tree Plan, *Staff Hawkins* replied that when a tree was removed, one was generally planted. She noted that staff intended to wait for the Master Tree Plan, and implement it as proposed.

With respect to the unfunded projects, *Chair Knox White* inquired whether the long-range transit plan update would start in Fall 2008. *Staff Khan* replied that the City applied for grant funding for this project, and that it was unfunded because the City had not heard back from the funding agency yet.

In response to an inquiry by *Chair Knox White* regarding the disposition of the program if the City did not receive the grant, *Staff Khan* replied that Public Works would need to remove the project.

Commissioner Schatmeier noted that there was a great deal of need, with few resources. He expressed concern about government priorities in general, and was glad to see there was a list of unfunded projects, which highlighted the need. He noted that bus shelters, which the Transportation Commission had expressed an interest in, were listed under "Other," without a proposed funding source. He was curious about the allocation. *Staff Hawkins* replied that went towards the Citywide Development Fee, and that a study identified specific projects. She noted that 27% would be paid for by development, and 73% to be paid for by the City; the General Fund would offset it.

Commissioner Schatmeier noted that the Long-Range Transit Plan update was listed in the unfunded category, and included language reading, "Pending approval of Caltrans Community-Based Transportation Planning." *Staff Khan* replied that was a grant that the City had applied for.

Commissioner Krueger inquired whether the \$157 million figure for curb ramps and \$86 million in sidewalk repairs on page 5 in the Unfunded Projects was correct, and not a typo. *Staff Hawkins* noted that they were correct, and that the sewer repair work was also in that range. She noted that the figure covered a complete replacement over 20 years. She noted that truncated domes at the intersections were required to comply with the ADA, which was a huge new cost.

Open public comment

Bill Smith noted that he would make his comments would be available on web video, and noted that he would like the Coast Guard housing to be converted into disabled veterans. He would like the infrastructure to be improved with a mini transit system that would be monitored with a collaborative public/private joint venture to be shared with the community at large.

Close public comment

Chair Knox White noted that \$250,000 had been identified in the two-year plan for the cross-estuary environmental project, which he believed was very good. However, he believed that the proposed project could become so large that it would not be able to move forward in three or four years. He suggested that with the tight City finances, that the money may be better used in other bike and pedestrian programs. He believed that the environmental study was very important, and that it should be done when possible.

Staff Hawkins noted that was included because the projects that received capital funding had feasibility studies, environmental studies and often, designs completed. She suggested that as the Transportation Commission consider going forward with the City Bicycle Plan update, that some of the other projects that would be funded be prioritized.

Commissioner Krueger noted that on page 7 in Unfunded Projects, the study for the Otis Reconfiguration caught his attention. He noted that the issue came up several times with the neighbors' concern about safety on Otis. *Staff Khan* noted that he was trying to get it funded through the TMP process, and that it was listed because it was presently unfunded. If the contingency money from the TMP is not used, these funds could possibly be used for the Otis Drive study.

Commissioner Krueger noted that the bus shelters were listed on the unfunded list, and he recalled that the City would go forward with the bus shelter program. He had hoped to get some grants, which had fallen through. He inquired whether it would be taken back to Council.

Commissioner Krueger moved to recommend that the City Council approve the CIP program, as well as the following: 1) bus shelter procurement and maintenance be brought back to City Council for direction on finding funding; 2) bicycle, pedestrian and transit projects be prioritized in the CIP; 3) if it appears unlikely that capital funding will be available for the cross-estuary bicycle/pedestrian crossing improvements, the funding reserved for the environmental work for the project be reallocated toward other projects in the bicycle plan; and 4) funding be made available to study the potential reconfiguration of Otis Drive. *Commissioner Ratto* seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

Chair Knox White suggested that the monetary figures in the reports be consistent so that they are reflected either in dollars or thousands of dollars. He noted that the score column was not explained, and suggested that it be eliminated if it is not clarified.

Staff Hawkins noted that it examined the environment, cost-effectiveness, available funding, and that it was an attempt to prioritize things.

7B. Proposed Implementation of Parking Restrictions on Central Avenue in Front of the New Theater and Cineplex to Improve Traffic Circulation and

Access.

Staff Khan presented the staff report, and summarized the background and details of this item. He noted that representatives of the Police Department were available to answer questions. He noted that their goal was to provide a clear access for the Police and Fire Departments in front of the theater, particularly with the number of people accessing it. He noted that other cities provided loading/unloading zones in front of the theater with no parking allowed to ensure that the environment was safe.

Commissioner Krueger recalled that there had been parallel parking and bike lanes prior to the construction project. *Staff Khan* confirmed that both were present in the recommended design. *Commissioner Krueger* inquired what would happen to the bike lanes if the parking was removed on one side. *Staff Khan* replied that the proposed design includes an eight-foot parking lane, a five-foot bike lane, and then the travel lane of 11-12 feet. *Commissioner Krueger* inquired whether traffic would have to pull into the parking area across the bike lane. *Staff Khan* replied that was in line with the standards, and was common in commercial zones. He noted that the speeds should not increase. The speeds would be controlled by the pedestrian and other activity near the street.

Commissioner Krueger noted that right-turning traffic onto Oak would create a *de facto* right-turn lane. *Staff Khan* replied that staff considered a right-turn lane, but there was not enough space or justification. *Commissioner Krueger* inquired whether a bulbout could be considered to prevent that situation. *Staff Khan* replied that was not considered as part of this item, and that the request came after the construction was nearly complete. He added that it could be considered in the future.

Open public comment.

Bill Smith noted that it was important to protect the safety of the children, and that cameras were important to monitor safety. He suggested that volunteers with police-quality cameras would help maintain decorum when large numbers of children attended a movie. He suggested that signage also be used to maintain control of the situation, and that a crosswalk be placed in the middle of the street as well.

Close public comment.

Commissioner Ratto inquired whether the yellow zone would be a “no parking” zone in non-loading hours. *Staff Khan* replied that the City would work with the Business Association in terms of the time, and that allowing parking had been considered for non-peak hours. The zone could be signed appropriately after consultation with the Business Association. *Commissioner Ratto* believed there should be no parking there, with the exception of commercial vehicles during certain times. He believed that the desire was to have no parking from that driveway up to Oak Street, and did not want to see people fighting over the parking spaces during off-hours. He noted that he supported this

concept, and that it would be considered by the Park Street Business Association (PSBA) Board of Directors at its next meeting.

Chair Knox White inquired where the 35 required bike parking spaces had gone. *Staff Bergman* replied that there were 40 spaces in the garage, including bike lockers and racks.

Chair Knox White noted that this plan was similar to the Jack London Cinema – a big theater with no parking in front of it, and across the street from a parking lot with no way to cross the street. He did not believe this was a pedestrian-friendly area. He believed it was unfortunate that this plan was coming forward at this time, after years of planning in this area. He noted that the traffic and parking plan came to the Transportation Commission two years ago, which he believed was the time to make these recommendations. He agreed with *Commissioner Krueger* that the red curb would become a *de facto* right turn lane, which would be more dangerous for pedestrians and bike riders trying to navigate the intersection. He did not see how 270 feet of no-parking zone could be created without a bulbout. He noted that he was not against the dropoff zone, but questioned whether that much space was needed either for dropoff or emergency access. He believed there should be bike parking in front of the theater, that bicyclists would be more likely to use this than the parking in the garage. He noted that other cities provided bike parking in front of the theater, and believed that those spaces would be full of bikes on a summer evening. He was concerned that the City was trying to solve this problem quickly and cheaply, and did not believe this added to the area. He had not heard anyone justify the need to park four or five fire trucks in front of the theater at any given moment, and believed this created a very unfriendly environment for pedestrians.

Lt. Dave Boersma, APD Traffic Division, noted that this was a compromise, and that from a public safety standpoint, he preferred a red zone in front of the entire area, without allowing any parking. He noted that 187 feet of white zone was a lot of space, and that at 20 feet per parking space, this would allow a lot of cars to park. He noted that an alternative to the red zone was to leave it as a metered parking zone, which created double parking problems in front of the building, and would not allow for emergency vehicle access. He noted that they were primarily concerned about the vehicular traffic flow through the area. He added that he hoped that drivers did use the red curb zone as a *de facto* right-turn lane, as this would keep the traffic flow moving. He was concerned that there would be a lot of traffic stuck at the red light on westbound Central Avenue at Oak Street, which would then back up and impact Park Street. APD proposed a right-turn lane at the intersection, but that there was not enough space where the street narrowed to put an actual right-turn only lane. They believed that having the red zone would be a good compromise.

Commissioner Krueger would like to see a mid-block crosswalk, as suggested by Mr. Smith. He noted that there will be a lot of pedestrians wanting to cross over to the theater entrance, and believed the City should acknowledge people's actual behaviors and design the crosswalk to suit.

Staff Khan noted that when crosswalks are designed, staff look at pedestrian visibility and safety; staff did not want the pedestrians to be a place where motorists did not expect them. By putting white lines on the street, a safe environment would not be provided, especially at night. He believed that a crosswalk at this location may create more concerns.

Commissioner Krueger inquired whether the alleyway met the standard to constitute an unmarked crosswalk. *Staff Khan* replied that the alleyway was an access point. He noted that between two signalized intersections, crossing would be considered jaywalking.

Lt. Boersma understood that an unmarked crosswalk must be a prolongation of the sidewalk; that there was no sidewalk, only a driveway onto private property. Therefore, there was no unmarked crosswalk.

Commissioner Ratto noted that a PSBA member who owned a restaurant across the street from the theater would request the PSBA Board to request that the City install a mid-block crosswalk with in-pavement crosswalk lights. He noted that as executive director of PSBA, he would work for this recommendation. However, as a Transportation Commissioner, he would vote against that recommendation. He noted that this could give a false sense of security to people crossing the street, and he did not believe that it was needed between two controlled lights. He understood the concern about the *de facto* right lane, and noted that PSBA would be against the bulbout at that corner, as it would negatively impact traffic flow. He inquired whether vehicles could turn left from Oak into the garage. *Staff Khan* replied that they could.

Commissioner Ratto believed that while 40 bike parking spaces in front of the theater was excessive, he suggested that some bike racks be put in proximity to the theater. *Staff Khan* replied that this could be done, and added that the City could use some grant money for that purpose. They also considered putting some bike parking in the alleyway.

Commissioner Krueger believed the priority should be putting the bikes in front of the theater, and that there would be security concerns with alleyway parking. He suggested that the real issues be acknowledged, that the proposal is more about maintaining traffic flow than meeting the needs of pedestrians. He believed that congested traffic would be better for pedestrians, and that smoothly flowing traffic would be more dangerous for the pedestrians.

Lt. Boersma noted that both traffic and pedestrian issues were relevant, and that drivers would still double park; there would also be a risk to passengers. He believed this would proposal would eliminate the ability to do that, and there would be an impact. He noted that there would be queues in front of the theater, especially for the blockbuster movies. He would discourage people crossing in between the two corners, and believed that a mid-block crosswalk would make things worse. He believed it would impede the traffic flow and give people a false sense of security. He believed the proposed plan addressed the pedestrian safety, traffic flow and emergency access issues.

Commissioner Ratto noted that this would not be set in stone, and that if there were problems, changes could be made.

Chair Knox White responded that it would be better to get the plan right the first time.

Chair Knox White noted that he would move against this, but did support removing the parking. He supported the creation of a dropoff zone, the commercial loading zone and the a red curb for sight lines. He opposed the creation of 270-foot-long *de facto* new lane along Central Avenue. He understood the sight line issue as described by the lieutenant, but was very concerned about drivers making right turns at the corner while pedestrians waited to cross. He would rather see a bulbout that would prohibit the quick right turn. He believed the proposed plan would not lead to good traffic flow and a vibrant downtown, but that the proposal could be changed to achieve that goal.

Commissioner Ratto moved to approve the staff recommendation to approve Proposed Implementation of Parking Restrictions on Central Avenue in Front of the New Theater and Cineplex to Improve Traffic Circulation and Access. *Commissioner McFarland* seconded the motion. Motion failed 2-5 (Knox-White, Krueger, Schatmeier, Subramaniam, Tam opposed).

Commissioner McFarland left the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

Commissioner Schatmeier moved to extend the meeting to 10:30 p.m. *Commissioner Subramaniam* seconded the motion. Motion passed 6-1 (Ratto opposed).

7C. Review of Draft Pedestrian Plan

Staff Khan presented the staff report, and acknowledged the hard work of Gail Payne in the preparation of the Draft Pedestrian Plan. This item will be brought back for action in the May meeting. He described the pedestrian plan in detail, and displayed the PowerPoint presentation on the overhead screen. He noted that it provided guidelines above and beyond the ADA guidelines. He noted that goals were recommended by the Transportation Commission as part of the TMP policies: circulation, livability, transportation choice and implementation. He noted that several public meetings were scheduled to discuss this plan, and described the progress of the plan. He described the points assigned to the project for reaching the project goals, totaling 100 points; a project totaling 70-80 points would trigger its implementation. He noted that high priority projects included those considered over the next 10 years; the high priority projects would cost approximately \$10 million over that time, and these included accessible signals, countdown signals, and intersection enhancements.

Staff Khan described the medium priority projects, which were planned over five-plus years, to be pursued after the high priority projects were funded. Staff expected \$2 million from Measure B sources, \$3 million from Safe Routes to School and competitive grants. He noted that public hearings would be conducted in April and May, and expected

that the Transportation Commission would hear this item for action in May. The final draft of the Pedestrian Plan will be created in May and June, and then taken to City Council for acceptance. Staff would like this plan to be adopted as part of the Transportation Element of the General Plan.

Open public comment.

Adrienne Langley-Cook noticed that the draft plan identified a walkway through her back yard, and requested that it be corrected to reflect that there was no such pathway.

Chair Knox White noted that this comment was passed to staff, and that it would be removed from the plan.

Tony Daysog complimented the Transportation Commission on its work, and wished to see Alameda become even more pedestrian friendly. He recalled past major pedestrian accidents. He noted that this was not only a quality of life issue, but also a safety issue.

Bill Smith echoed Mr. Daysog's comments, described a recent serious pedestrian accident and re-emphasized the need for pedestrian safety.

Close public comment.

Chair Knox White commended Gail Payne on the quality of this plan.

No action was taken.

8. Staff Communications.

Staff Khan noted that a meeting was held earlier in the day on the Broadway-Jackson Study update. The project is moving forward as scheduled, and staff hoped to meet with the Chinatown community in May. He anticipated bringing it to the Transportation Commission for its June 25 meeting. The goal is that the project study report will be completed and submitted to Caltrans by the end of July. He noted that good feedback had been received from the Oakland and Alameda communities, and believed that consensus has been building towards the alternative in terms of providing access through Sixth Street, as well as providing new ramps as discussed.

Chair Knox White believed that it would be good to have a public hearing in Alameda to make it more convenient to Alamedans, particularly since the City was paying for part of the project.

Staff Khan noted that the Estuary Crossing Feasibility Study was moving forward, and distributed a handout to the Commissioners. The study would look into alternatives that will address several user requirements, as identified by Gail Payne. Several meetings will be held, and the study schedule was listed on page 4. Two meetings have been held on

April 10 and April 12, one in Oakland and one in Alameda. More meetings will be held in May, at the Jack London Aquatic Center and at City Hall West. The Draft Report will be presented in the fall of 2008, and staff hoped to complete the project with a recommendation to City Council in early 2009.

Chair Knox White inquired whether the Transportation Commission was involved in the process. *Staff Khan* replied that this item would be brought to the Transportation Commission one or two times.

Staff Bergman noted that future agenda items included a presentation on AC Transit's Line 51 Task Force in either the June or July meeting. He noted that AC Transit was in the process of making staffing changes so that potential service changes on Line O are still being studied. *Staff Khan* noted that preliminary data from AC Transit indicate that few local riders were using Line O, so the elimination of local service on the transbay route that had initially been discussed may not be appropriate.

Staff Khan noted that the universal transit pass program was being discussed for use by all City employees, which may be implemented by June. He noted that the passes would include the bearer's photo.

Staff Khan noted that staff had been directed to work with AC Transit staff regarding the potential implementation of shuttle service between Alameda and BART.

Chair Knox White wished to ensure that there would be sufficient notification for future appeals. He believed there should be a written procedure requiring noticing when a tentative agenda was set. Residents would be informed at least 20 days in advance if possible, and a staff report and additional information would be available a week in advance.

Staff Khan noted that he had a video from Paden Elementary School that he had originally planned to show this evening, but would show at a later time.

9. Adjournment: 10:30 p.m.

G:\pubworks\LT\TRANSPORTATION\COMMITTEES\TC\2008\052808\042308minutes-draft-rev.doc